

## PBGC - Premium Accounting

[redacted]

Agency: **012**

### Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

#### Part I: Summary Information And Justification

##### Section A: Overview

1. Date of submission: **Dec 28, 2007**
2. Agency: **012**
3. Bureau: **12**
4. Name of this Capital Asset: **PBGC - Premium Accounting**
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: **012-12-01-01-01-2065-00**
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? **Mixed Life Cycle**
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? **FY2005**
8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap: **This investment funds a \$24M modernization plan for Premium Accounting (PA) Services from FY2008-2013. PA is a collection of systems that process approximately \$1.5 Billion in insurance premiums paid by insured pension plans, as required by ERISA, and to accrue interest and assess penalties on unpaid past due premiums. In addition, PA manages premium filer's plan data, manages premium correspondence, enables premium filers to administer their accounts online, and images premium records. PBGC depends on PA to meet performance measures for customer service. As identified in the agency's strategic plan, customer satisfaction is measured using the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI). FY 2007 premium filer score was 70 out of 100, a relatively high score compared with other regulatory reporting agencies and increased from 2006 even though the PBGC had implemented mandatory e-filing for large plans in 2006. The score was achieved through additional customer outreach, expansion of support programs and introduction of Web-based seminars that were well attended. To continue to maintain target ACSI scores, PA must improve in security, efficiency, and performance. The modernization plan for PA completes security certifications (03/08) and maintains current security and privacy initiatives, consolidates supporting applications to reduce the number of steady state projects, improves efficiencies through increased internet services and more efficient business processes for PBGC staff and PBGC premium filers, and continues steady state support of existing systems and services to maintain ACSI scores. PBGC has made significant progress in its goal to reduce expenses and delays involved with processing premiums as well as reengineer and modernize its dated business processes. During FY08, PBGC expects to implement a key milestone in its modernization plan by rolling out the Premium and Practitioner System. This milestone tightly integrates this investment with PBGC's Consolidated Financial System—representing significant progress in addressing PBGC's systems integration reportable condition. In FY2008-2009, the modernization plan schedules implementation of regulations resulting from the Pension Protection Act of 2006 which includes reforms to**

**the premium structure. In FY2011 and beyond, the vast majority of DME is spent solely to support legislative changes and modernization efforts to further consolidate systems and maintain performance measures.**

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? **Jun 29, 2007**
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? **yes**
11. Contact information of Project Manager?

Name **Scott Byrum 1200 K Street, NW Suite 530 Washington, DC 20005**  
 Phone Number **202-326-4000**[redacted]  
 E-mail **byrum.scott@pbgc.gov**

- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager? **TBD**
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energyefficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project. **no**
  - a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? **yes**
  - b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) **no**
    1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? **no**
    2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? **no**
    3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? **no**

13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? **yes**

**Financial Performance**

**Expanded E-Government**

- a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? **Financial Performance: improves accuracy of premium data, reduces cost of administration; reduces amount of time needed to determine premium income, receivables and payables to meet the accelerated reporting objectives. Expanded E-Gov: creates a central repository for data, reduces reporting burden for premium filers, enables PBGC to share information with other government agencies. Web-based front-end application used by filers to submit premium filings under mandatory e-filing regulation**
14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit [www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)) **yes**
  - a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? **no**
  - b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? **Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation**
  - c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? **Moderately Effective**
15. Is this investment for information technology? **yes**

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) **Level 2**

- 17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) **(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment**
- 18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4-FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)? **no**
- 19. Is this a financial management system? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? **yes**
    - 1. If "yes," which compliance area: **Integration of Financial Systems**
    - 2. If "no," what does it address? **[Not answered]**
  - b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52 **Premium Accounting System**
- 20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2009 funding request for the following?

Hardware **1**  
 Software **1**  
 Services **98**  
 Other **[Not answered]**

- 21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities? **yes**
- 22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name **Philip Hertz**  
 Phone Number **202-326-4000**[redacted]  
 Title **Deputy General Counsel and Senior Privacy Official**  
 E-mail **hertz.philip@pbgc.gov**

- 23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? **yes**
- 24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? **no**

**Section B: Summary of Spending**

1.

<b>Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)</b>									
<i>(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)</i>									
	<b>PY-1 and earlier</b>	<b>PY 2007</b>	<b>CY 2008</b>	<b>BY 2009</b>	<b>BY+1 2010</b>	<b>BY+2 2011</b>	<b>BY+3 2012</b>	<b>BY+4 and beyond</b>	<b>Total</b>
Planning:	3.072	0.385	0.896	0.894	0.323	0.156	0.164	0.171	6.061
Acquisition:	13.459	2.415	4.304	2.598	0.986	0.487	0.509	0.531	22.553
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	16.531	2.800	5.200	3.492	1.309	0.643	0.673	0.702	28.614

<b>Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)</b>									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
Operations & Maintenance:	2.3	1.525	2.202	2.214	2.232	2.25	2.28	2.311	17.314
TOTAL:	18.831	4.325	7.402	5.706	3.541	2.893	2.953	3.013	45.928
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	0.57	0.600	0.600	0.700	0.687	0.398	0.408	0.419	4.42
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	37

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? **no**
  - a. If "yes", How many and in what year? **[Not answered]**
3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: **No significant changes. Government FTE costs for this investment are only included for FY 2006 and later. Costs for Government FTEs for periods earlier than FY 2006 are not included. For FY 2008, Planning and Acquisition funds have been earmarked and will be used based on the outcomes of an Enterprise Architecture analysis and a Strategic Portfolio Analysis that is currently underway. The financial management segment architecture will identify performance gaps and corporate priorities, and also establish a high level transition strategy based on alternative analyses and cost/benefits assessments. These efforts will provide PBGC with a roadmap of what investments to make in the financial management systems going forward. FY 2008 and FY 2009 have increased from 4.01 Million and 4.43 Million, respectively, to 5.806 Million and 5.806 Million, respectively. This increase represents costs to Implement premium regulations required by the Pension Protection Act (PPA) of 2006 and the Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) of 2005 and costs to meet new performance measures after enactment of the Pension Protection Act that comprise activities required to implement the new premium reforms. FY 2010 and beyond have decreased from the FY 2008 President’s budget request from 4.4 Million per year to under 3.6 Million per year. This decrease represents expected benefits gained from improvements made through greater consolidation, integration, performance measurement, customer service, and usability enhancement efforts.**

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

- 1.

<b>Contracts/Task Orders Table:</b>	
<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	CT-03-0681; Premium Accounting Redesign: Business Process Reengineering, Premium & Practitioner System Functional Specifications, Independent Verification and Validation
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order</b>	Cost Plus Fixed Fee

<b>Contracts/Task Orders Table:</b>	
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	yes
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	Aug 1, 2003
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Aug 1, 2003
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Dec 31, 2007
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	4.44
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	no
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	no
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	yes
<b>What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?</b>	NA
<b>Is EVM in the contract?</b>	yes
<b>Does the contract include the required security &amp; privacy clauses?</b>	yes
<b>Name of CO</b>	Kay Rison
<b>CO Contact information</b>	202-326-4000 [redacted], rison.kay@pbgc.gov
<b>Contracting Officer Certification Level</b>	3
<b>If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?</b>	yes
<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	CT-06-0761; Implement and maintain the Premium Practitioner System
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order</b>	Firm fixed price (implementation), Time and Materials (follow-on support)
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	yes
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	Aug 31, 2006
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Sep 30, 2006
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Sep 30, 2010
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	12.97
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	no
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	no
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	yes
<b>What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?</b>	NA
<b>Is EVM in the contract?</b>	yes
<b>Does the contract include the required security &amp; privacy clauses?</b>	yes
<b>Name of CO</b>	Kay Rison
<b>CO Contact information</b>	202-326-4000 [redacted], rison.kay@pbgc.gov
<b>Contracting Officer Certification Level</b>	3
<b>If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?</b>	yes
<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	DO-01-030-0195; Support the Premium Accounting System; provide data conversion support for the

<b>Contracts/Task Orders Table:</b>	
	Premium and Practitioner System
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order</b>	Time and Materials
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	yes
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	Jul 30, 2003
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Aug 1, 2003
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Apr 30, 2008
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	3
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	no
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	no
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	yes
<b>What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?</b>	NA
<b>Is EVM in the contract?</b>	no
<b>Does the contract include the required security &amp; privacy clauses?</b>	yes
<b>Name of CO</b>	Kay Rison
<b>CO Contact information</b>	202-326-4000 [redacted], rison.kay@pbgc.gov
<b>Contracting Officer Certification Level</b>	3
<b>If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?</b>	yes
<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	GS35F4594G; Support PBGC's MyPlan Administrator Account (PBGC's practitioner-facing system in support of GPEA, E-Gov and E-Filing)
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order</b>	Time and Materials
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	yes
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	Mar 31, 2006
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Apr 1, 2006
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Sep 30, 2008
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	2.86
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	no
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	no
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	yes
<b>What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?</b>	NA
<b>Is EVM in the contract?</b>	yes
<b>Does the contract include the required security &amp; privacy clauses?</b>	yes
<b>Name of CO</b>	Kay Rison
<b>CO Contact information</b>	202-326-4000 [redacted], rison.kay@pbgc.gov
<b>Contracting Officer Certification Level</b>	3
<b>If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?</b>	yes

<b>Contracts/Task Orders Table:</b>	
<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	Proposed Contract - Follow-on support for the Premium and Practitioner System
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order</b>	Cost Plus Fixed Fee
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	no
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	Sep 30, 2008
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Oct 1, 2008
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Sep 30, 2013
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	[redacted]
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	no
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	yes
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	yes
<b>What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?</b>	NA
<b>Is EVM in the contract?</b>	yes
<b>Does the contract include the required security &amp; privacy clauses?</b>	yes
<b>Name of CO</b>	Kay Rison
<b>CO Contact information</b>	202-326-4000 [redacted], rison.kay@pbgc.gov
<b>Contracting Officer Certification Level</b>	3
<b>If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?</b>	yes
<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	Proposed Contract II - Follow-on support for My Plan Administration Account
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order</b>	Cost Plus Fixed Fee
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	no
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	Sep 30, 2010
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Oct 1, 2010
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Sep 30, 2013
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	[redacted]
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	no
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	yes
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	yes
<b>What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?</b>	NA
<b>Is EVM in the contract?</b>	yes
<b>Does the contract include the required security &amp; privacy clauses?</b>	yes
<b>Name of CO</b>	Kay Rison
<b>CO Contact information</b>	202-326-4000 [redacted], rison.kay@pbgc.gov
<b>Contracting Officer Certification Level</b>	3
<b>If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this</b>	yes

<b>Contracts/Task Orders Table:</b>	
<b>acquisition?</b>	

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why: **The PAS contract does not report EV since it is a contract on steady state of maintenance and requires minimal development effort. Therefore the PAS contract does not meet any of the criteria set forth by the PMO office for reporting earned value. PBGC’s project manager manages cost, schedule, and performance on this contract without EVM by assessing progress reports, invoice tracking, and on-site observations against project schedules and proposal milestones as documented in MS Project Plan and Excel budgeting spreadsheets.**
3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **yes**
  - a. Explain why: **Section 508 compliance is an explicit, mandatory requirement enforced by the Corporation’s contracting officer and wholly supported by its General Counsel and its Chief Information Officer. The system will fully meet the following technical requirement: provide an application interface that complies with the software application standards required by Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, as detailed in 36 CFR 1194, Subpart B.**
4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? **no**
  - a. If "yes," what is the date? **[Not answered]**
  - b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? **yes**
    1. If "no," briefly explain why: **[Not answered]**

**Section D: Performance Information**

<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
2006	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	87% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	3% improvement over the baseline	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt.
2006	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	American Customer Service Index (ACSI) Score for Premium Filer Service. The PBGC developed new performance measures after enactment of the Pension	68 out of a possible 100	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	68 out of a possible 100. PBGC met its 2006 performance measure despite the occurrence of several events expected to have a negative effect on



Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
				Protection Act that comprise activities required to implement the new premium reforms.			sponsors views of the PBGCs operations, including the start of mandatory premium e-filing for large plans
2006	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 45 days.	85% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 45 days	2% improvement over the baseline score of 85%	87% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 45 days
2006	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	1% of Premium filings are submitted electronically (E-Filing)	4% of Premium filings were submitted electronically (E-Filing)	8% of Premium filings were submitted electronically
2007	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	Maintain current baseline	Q1 FY2008
2007	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	out of a possible 100	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	70 out of a possible 100
2007	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	85 % of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30days	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2008
2007	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	8% of Premium filings are submitted electronically (E-Filing)	30% of total Premium filings will be submitted electronically (E-Filing)	Q1 FY2008
2008	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days	Maintain baseline%	Q1 FY2009

<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
	Stakeholders			receipt	of receipt		
2008	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	69 out of a possible 100	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2009
2008	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	90% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2009
2008	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	90% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2009
2009	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	Maintain baseline%	Q1 FY2010
2009	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	70 out of a possible 100	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2010
2009	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	95% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2010
2009	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	95 % of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2010
2010	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	Maintain baseline%	Q1 FY2011

<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
2010	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	70 out of a possible 100	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2011
2010	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	95% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2011
2010	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted Electronically (E-Filing)	95% of Premium Filings submitted Electronically (E-Filing)	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2011
2011	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	Maintain baseline%	Q1 FY2012
2011	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	70 out of a possible 100	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2012
2011	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	95% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2012
2011	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	95% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2012
2012	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	Maintain baseline%	Q1 FY2013
2012	Provide	Customer	Customer	ACSI Score for	Target will be	Meet or	Q1 FY2013

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Results	Satisfaction	Premium Filer Service	determined during FY 2007-2012 Strategic Planning	exceed Baseline Target	
2012	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	95% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2013
2012	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	95% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2013
2013	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	Maintain baseline%	Q1 FY2014
2013	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	Target will be determined during FY 2008-2013 Strategic Planning	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2014
2013	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	95% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days.	Meet or Exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2014
2013	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	95% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2014

### Section E: Security and Privacy

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment: **yes**
  - a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: **7**

2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment. **yes**

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
PPS	Government Only	Jan 15, 2008	Jan 14, 2008

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:							
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37?	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
PAS	Government Only	Moderate	yes	May 9, 2003	Other	Oct 1, 2006	Aug 12, 2006
MyPAA	Government Only	Moderate	yes	Mar 9, 2004	Other	Jul 5, 2007	Feb 3, 2007

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process? **yes**
6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness. **As stated in response to question 8, PPS tightly integrates this investment with PBGC’s Consolidated Financial System—representing significant progress in addressing PBGC’s systems integration reportable condition. PBGC completed the risk assessment and updated the system security plan for PPS. The security for PPS is provided in function by PBGC’s Consolidated Financial System (CFS). PBGC completed a NIST SP 800-37 compliant certification and accreditation of the CFS system June 29, 2007, and has a comprehensive plan of action & milestones (POA&M) for addressing the security deficiencies. PBGC is funding improvement actions defined in the POA&M to correct the weaknesses through existing budgets. PBGC completed testing security controls July 7, 2007. Deficiencies that were identified have also been incorporated into comprehensive POA&M for addressing the security deficiencies, and those too will be funded through existing budgets. With the implementation of new functionality, additional security controls will be required. This business case requests seven percent of the project to be used for security. That funding will be used to conduct annual risk assessments, update system security plans, perform C&As, establish continuous monitoring for**

**enhancements and perform the function of continuous monitoring of the new functionality. A NIST SP 800-37 compliant certification and accreditation (C&A) of PAS and MyPAA has been initiated and is scheduled to be completed no later than March 2008**

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? **All PBGC systems are jointly run and managed by federal employees and contractor teams reporting to PBGC federal employees. PBGC contracts include language to ensure the suitability of contractors' employees, and inspection of all new or renovated contractor hosting sites. PBGC federal employees and contractors are subject to suitability background investigations. New federal employees and contractors are issued roles of conduct, required to take computer security awareness orientation, and provided instruction on incident reporting procedures. Annually, federal employees and contractors are required to take refresher security awareness training. Role-based training is conducted during employee position training. For positions related to the Designated Approving Authority, Information System Owner, System Administrators and Project Managers, role-based training is conducted by PBGC's Enterprise Security Team following orientation, and annually thereafter.**  
[redacted]

**8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:**

<b>Name of System</b>	<b>Is this a new system?</b>	<b>Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?</b>	<b>Internet Link or Explanation</b>	<b>Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?</b>	<b>Internet Link or Explanation</b>
PAS	no	yes	<a href="http://www.pbgc.gov/about/PIA.html">http://www.pbgc.gov/about/PIA.html</a>	no	<a href="http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index.ht">http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index.ht</a>
MyPAA	no	yes	<a href="http://www.pbgc.gov/about/PIA.html">http://www.pbgc.gov/about/PIA.html</a>	no	<a href="http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index.ht">http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index.ht</a>
PPS	yes	yes	<a href="http://www.pbgc.gov/about/PIA.html">http://www.pbgc.gov/about/PIA.html</a>	no	<a href="http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index.ht">http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index.ht</a>

**Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA)**

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? **yes**
  - a. If "no," please explain why? [Not answered]
2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. **Premium & Practitioner System (PPS) and My Plan Administration Account (MyPAA)**
  - b. If "no," please explain why? [Not answered]
3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. **Financial Management Segment**

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table :							
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	Service Component Reused		Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
				Component Name	UPI		
PPS	Premium Collection and processing accounting system	Financial Management	Revenue Management	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
PPS	Premium Collection and processing accounting system	Data Management	Data Warehouse	Data Warehouse	012-12-01-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5
PPS	Premium Collection and processing accounting system	Financial Management	Auditing	[Not answered]	012-12-01-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5
PPS	Premium Collection and processing accounting system	Financial Management	Billing and Accounting	[Not answered]	012-12-01-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5
PPS	Premium Collection and processing accounting system	Financial Management	Payment / Settlement	[Not answered]	012-12-01-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5
MyPAA	Customer facing website for electronic filing of premiums due PBGC and the management of customer information related to premium filings	Financial Management	Credit / Charge	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
MyPAA	Customer facing website for electronic filing of premiums due PBGC	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table :							
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	Service Component Reused		Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
				Component Name	UPI		
	and the management of customer information related to premium filings						
MyPAA	Customer facing website for electronic filing of premiums due PBGC and the management of customer information related to premium filings	Customer Relationship Management	Contact and Profile Management	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
MyPAA	Customer facing website for electronic filing of premiums due PBGC and the management of customer information related to premium filings	Customer Relationship Management	Customer / Account Management	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
MyPAA	Customer facing website for electronic filing of premiums due PBGC and the management of customer information related to premium filings	Content Management	Content Publishing and Delivery	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
IPS	Image processing	Document Management	Document Conversion	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	Internal	5



4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table :							
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	Service Component Reused		Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
				Component Name	UPI		
	and storage system for PBGC documents						
IPS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Document Management	Document Imaging and OCR	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	Internal	5
IPS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Document Management	Document Referencing	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	Internal	5
IPS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Document Management	Indexing	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	Internal	5
IPS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Document Management	Library / Storage	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	Internal	5
IPS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Records Management	Document Classification	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	Internal	5
IPS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Records Management	Record Linking / Association	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	Internal	5
eALG	Letter generation and management service	Routing and Scheduling	Outbound Correspondence Management	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	Internal	5

**5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:**

<b>FEA SRM Component</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Area</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Category</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Standard</b>	<b>Service Specification</b>
Revenue Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	Oracle Financials (Receivables)
Revenue Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	PBGC Web standards regarding W3C, PIA, compliance (primary target MS IE)
Revenue Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	PBGC Networking standards
Revenue Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle database pre PBGC standards and Hitachi SAN when relevant
Revenue Management	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Will utilize the PBGC Common Security Services and Security Architecture
Revenue Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EA Blueprint standards concerning J2EE and Oracle Application Server
Revenue Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Credit / Charge	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	Oracle Financials (Receivables)
Credit / Charge	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	PBGC Web standards regarding W3C, PIA, compliance (primary target MS IE)
Credit / Charge	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	PBGC Network standards
Credit / Charge	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle database pre PBGC standards and Hitachi SAN when relevant
Credit / Charge	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Will utilize the PBGC Common Security Services Architecture
Credit / Charge	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EA Blueprint standards concerning J2EE and Oracle Application Server
Credit / Charge	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Self-Service	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	Oracle Financials (Receivables)
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	PBGC Web standards regarding W3C, PIA, compliance (primary target MS IE)
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	PBGC Networking standards
Self-Service	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle Database pre PBGC standards and Hitachi SAN

<b>5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:</b>				
<b>FEA SRM Component</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Area</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Category</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Standard</b>	<b>Service Specification</b>
				when relevant
Self-Service	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Will utilize the PBGC Common Services and Security Architecture
Self-Service	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EA Blueprint standards concerning J2EE and Oracle Application Server
Self-Service	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Contact and Profile Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	Oracle Financials (receivables)
Contact and Profile Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	PBGC Web standards regarding W3C, PIA, compliance (primary target MS IE)
Contact and Profile Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	PBGC Networking standards
Contact and Profile Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracl Database pre PBGC standards and Hitachi SAN when relevant
Contact and Profile Management	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Will utilize the PBGC Common Security Services and Security Architecture
Contact and Profile Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EA Blueprint standards concerning J2EE and Oracle Application Server
Contact and Profile Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	Oracle Financials (receivables)
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	PBGC Web standards regarding W3C, PIA, compliance (primary target MS IE)
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	PBGC Networking standards
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle Database per PBGC standards and Hitachi SAN when relevant
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Will utilize the PBGC Common Security Services and Security Architecture
Customer /	Service Interface	Integration	Middleware	EA Blueprint standards

<b>5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:</b>				
<b>FEA SRM Component</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Area</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Category</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Standard</b>	<b>Service Specification</b>
Account Management	and Integration			concerning J2EE and Oracle Application Server
Customer / Account Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	Oracle Financials (receivables)
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	PBGC Web standards regarding W3C, PIA, compliance (primary target MS IE)
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	PBGC Networking standards
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle Database per PBGC standards and Hitachi SAN when relevant
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Will utilize the PBGC Common Security Services and Security Architecture
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EA Blueprint standards concerning J2EE and Oracle Application Server
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)? **no**
- a. If "yes," please describe. [Not answered]

**Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information**

**Section A: Alternatives Analysis**

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? **no**
- a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? [Not answered]
- b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? **Jun 30, 2008**
- c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why: [Not answered]

**2. Alternatives Analysis Results:**

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Baseline-Modernize PA to be minimally compliant with the Pension Protection Act of 2006	Continue modernization activities (improvements in security, efficiency, and performance measures) and accomplish only a portion of that required to fully implement legislative changes resulting from the Pension Protection Act of 2006: Legislative changes (Interest on Refunds, Special Filings for Small Plans); Automate other receivables processing 33%; Participant Notice Audit; Automation of Information Request (CRM) Processes.	41.08	11.5
Alternative I (Recommended Approach) - Modernize PA to be fully compliant with the Pension Protection Act of 2006	Alternative 1 allows PBGC to continue modernization activities relating to improvements in security, efficiency, and performance measures, and accomplish all activities required to fully implement legislative changes resulting from the Pension Protection Act of 2006. Building on the above baseline alternative, this alternative provides a comprehensive long-term solution to most efficiently meet evolving requirements in this critical line of PBGC’s business.	50.35	26
Alternative 2 - Expanded Baseline Functionality	Continue modernization activities relating to improvements in security, efficiency, and performance measures, and accomplish most activities required to fully implement legislative changes resulting from the Pension Protection Act of 2006: While this alternative provides key modernization activities, it does not provide the most comprehensive long-term solution of the alternatives analyzed. Activities will be accomplished during 2008 and nothing beyond.	46.67	16.8
Alternative 3 - Diminished Baseline Functionality	Alternative 3 allows PBGC to continue with a minimal collection of modernization activities relating to improvements in security, efficiency, and performance measures, and minimally implement requirements resulting from the Pension Protection Act of 2006. A minimal set of activities will be accomplished during 08 and nothing in the out years: Legislative changes (Interest on Refunds, Special Filings for Small Plans); Fed Debt Interface (Automation of debt collection); Participant Notice Audit	40.59	9.6

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen? **For this investment, Alternative 1 was selected. Continuing to modernize PBGC’s Premium Accounting investment addresses PBGC’s obligations relating to security, allows continued progress in addressing challenges identified in reportable conditions, ensures continued high customer service performance measurements, and incorporates legislative changes required by the Pension Protection Act. Additionally, modernization activities target the following improvements: improved**

accuracy and better stewardship of premium filing records, improved timeliness (filings, refunds, invoices, notices), improved efficiency (of internal processing, lowered system maintenance requirements), faster collections, and progressively improved customer satisfaction despite additional mandatory e-filing regulations in accordance with the President's Management Agenda to expand electronic government (large plans must e-file starting plan year 2006; while all plans must e-file starting plan year 2007). The expected benefits of Alternative 1 exceed those projected for the other alternatives. Projected Benefits through FY 2013 include: Increased Revenue resulting from more timely billing, \$12 Million; Reduced contractor costs resulting from expanding eGov capabilities, \$2.7 Million; Reduced FTE costs resulting from improved data accuracy and improved business processes, \$1.2 Million. Efforts are underway to identify and quantify the impacts of the Pension Protection Act of 2006 to the Premium Accounting Investment. Through a collaboration of PBGC's Enterprise Architects, Professional Project Managers, Security Professionals, and PBGC's business units, a comprehensive analysis of alternatives is underway to identify the optimal approach for implementing the requirements to meet the Pension Protection Act of 2006 while continuing to modernize this investment to target needed improvements in security, efficiency, and performance measures. This effort will develop updated calculations for NPV, ROI, Cost-Benefit Ratio, and Payback Period. The PBGC will leverage these tools which, together with qualitative measures, serve as integral drivers for key business-decisions for the the Premium Accounting Investment's approach and vision that PBGC senior leaders are currently considering. PBGC is not looking to modernize for the sake of modernizing; rather, provide the greatest service and stewardship to its internal and external customers while complying with evolving legislation.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? **Modernizing PBGC's Premium Accounting investment allows PBGC to realize an enhanced public perspective of PBGC's service by achieving the capability to prepare a full and complete response to customer queries with a single search of PBGC premium filing records, perhaps during the initial contact event, such as during a telephone call. Significant progress made in closing the gap to address and remove PBGC's reportable conditions. This investment provides continued focus to PBGC's strategic goals so that PBGC continues to be regarded as an exemplar of integrity, efficient stewardship and performance excellence. Financial reporting/internal controls will be improved due to improved data integrity (with minimal manual processing). Modernized business processes will realize business operations improvements in terms of reduced cycle times and (e.g., peak season premium filing delays will be reduced) and improved support for other PBGC departments (e.g., more accurate and timely information). PBGC's customers will experience greater customer service in terms of reduced mailing costs, more timely filings, and greater transparency (e.g., filers can more easily access their account balance and filing status on-line).**
5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment? **This Investment**
  - b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment or Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
Premium Accounting System	[Not answered]	Jan 15, 2008

### Section B: Risk Management

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? **no**
  - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? [Not answered]
  - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? **yes**
  - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes: **Following the passage of The Pension Protection Act signed by President Bush in August, 2006, the Premium Filing Services Risk Management Plan was reviewed for completeness and updated to reflect how Risks that arise due to legislative changes are identified, characterized (qualitatively and quantitatively), and managed. The Premium Accounting Services Project Team evaluated impacts of the legislative changes to DME activities underway and in planning. The Project Team determined that the existing Premium Accounting Services Risk Management Plan was not sufficient for this investment, and has committed to completing the development of a new Risk Management Plan by 6/30/2008.**
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? **Jun 30, 2008**
  - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? [Not answered]
3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: **When developing the Premium Accounting Service's lifecycle cost estimate and initiative schedule, PBGC performed a careful analysis of initiative risks using multiple risk identification techniques (e.g., brainstorming, checklists, task analysis, critical path analysis) to ensure comprehensive risk identification. By identifying risks through promoting a forward-looking view, the Premium Accounting Services project team looked toward the future, identified uncertainties, and anticipated potential outcomes. Where appropriate, risk contingencies and mitigation strategies are incorporated in the initiative's costs and schedules estimates. The budget will be divided into areas of support, which will be aligned with the project schedule. Project schedules track activities relating to risk, specifically: MOUs and ISAs, OMB reporting, application and data releases, partner working groups and meetings, and overall project management. During the analysis, opportunity was weighed against risk - recognizing both the potential value of opportunity and the potential impact of adverse effects, such as cost overrun, time delay, or failure to meet the requirements of a modernized Premium Accounting Services program that provides superior customer service while further consolidating PBGC's financial systems to address audit findings. Contingency and mitigation plans are specific to the risk, are actionable, are costed, are scheduled, and are tracked to completion.**

### Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748? **no**
2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than ± 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) **no**
  - a. If "yes," was it the? [Not answered]
  - b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance: [Not answered]
  - c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions [Not answered]
3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? **no**
  - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? [Not answered]

**4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:**

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned:Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned:Actual		Schedule:Cost (# days/\$M)		
FY2006 & Prior Premium Filing Systems Modernization Initiation and Planning	Feb 15, 2006	3.58	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	3.584	3.07	0	-0.51	100
FY2006 & Prior Premium Filing Systems Modernization eGov Implementation	Sep 30, 2006	3.75	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	3.75	3.75	0	0	100
FY2006 & Prior Premium Filing Systems Modernization Detailed Functional Design	Mar 31, 2006	1.16	Mar 31, 2006	Mar 31, 2006	0.6	0.6	0	0	100
FY2006 & Prior Premium Filing Systems Modernization Implementation	Sep 30, 2007	7.05	Sep 30, 2007	[Not answered]	7.05	5.288	0	1.762	75
FY2006 & Prior Premium Filing Systems Modernization IV&V	Sep 30, 2007	0.6	Sep 30, 2007	[Not answered]	0.6	0.45	0	0.15	75
FY2006 & Prior Premium Filing Systems Modernization Post Implementation Support	Dec 31, 2007	0.4	Dec 31, 2007	[Not answered]	0.4	[Not answered]	0	0	0



4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:									
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned:Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned:Actual		Schedule:Cost (# days/\$M)		
FY2006 PBGC Premium Filing Services Program Management	Sep 30, 2006	0.057	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	0.057	0.057	0	0	100
FY2006 & Prior O&M	Sep 30, 2006	3.36	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	3.36	3.36	0	0	100
FY2007 Planning	Sep 30, 2007	0.386	Sep 30, 2007	[Not answered]	0.386	0.29	0	0.096	75
FY2007 Premium Filing Systems Consolidation Implementation	Sep 30, 2007	1.175	Sep 30, 2007	[Not answered]	1.175	0.882	0	0.293	75
FY2007 PBGC Premium Filing Services Program Management	Sep 30, 2007	0.627	Sep 30, 2007	[Not answered]	0.627	0.47	0	0.157	75
FY2007 O&M	Sep 30, 2007	1.525	Sep 30, 2007	[Not answered]	1.525	1.144	0	0.381	75
FY2008 Planning	Sep 30, 2008	0.897	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.897	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2008 Consolidation, Performance Measurement, Customer Service, Usability Enhancements	Sep 30, 2008	0.024	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.024	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2008 Legislative Changes Support (Interest on Refunds, Special Filings for Small Plans)	Sep 30, 2008	0.932	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.932	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2008 PBGC Premium Filing Services Program Management	Sep 30, 2008	0.642	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.642	[Not answered]	0	0	0

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:									
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned:Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned:Actual		Schedule:Cost (# days/\$M)		
FY2008 Automate other receivables processing	Sep 30, 2008	0.15	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.15	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2008 Fed Debt Interface (Automation of debt collection)	Sep 30, 2008	0.2	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2008 Participant Notice Audit	Sep 30, 2008	0.275	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.275	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2008 Automated Premium Audit	Sep 30, 2008	0.275	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.275	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2008 Automation of Information Request (CRM) Processes	Sep 30, 2008	0.2	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2008 Premium Investigation Process Automation	Sep 30, 2008	0.1	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.1	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2008 O&M	Sep 30, 2008	2.203	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	2.203	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2008 Security & EA Initiatives	Sep 30, 2008	0.553	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.553	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2009 Planning	Sep 30, 2009	0.308	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.308	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2009 Consolidation, Performance Measurement, Customer Service, Usability Enhancements	Sep 30, 2009	0.366	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.366	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2009 Legislative Changes Support	Sep 30, 2009	0.191	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.191	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2009 PBGC Premium Filing	Sep 30, 2009	0.669	Sep 30,	[Not answered]	0.669	[Not answered]	0	0	0

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:									
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned:Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned:Actual		Schedule:Cost (# days/\$M)		
Services Program Management			2009						
FY2009 Automate the Notice of Filing Error (NFE) process	Sep 30, 2009	1.304	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	1.304	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2009 Automate verification of Full Funding Limit (FFL) qualification	Sep 30, 2009	0.35	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.35	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2009 Automation of Information Request (CRM) Processes	Sep 30, 2009	0.3	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2009 Premium Investigation Process Automation	Sep 30, 2009	0.225	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.225	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2009 O&M	Sep 30, 2009	2.215	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	2.215	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2009 Security & EA Initiatives	Sep 30, 2009	0.553	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.553	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2010 PPS Planning	Sep 30, 2010	0.323	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.323	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2010 Consolidation, Performance Measurement, Customer Service, Usability Enhancements	Sep 30, 2010	0.25	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.25	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2010 Legislative Changes Support	Sep 30, 2010	0.219	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.219	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2010 PBGC Premium Filing Services	Sep 30, 2010	0.687	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.687	[Not answered]	0	0	0

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:									
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned:Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned:Actual		Schedule:Cost (# days/\$M)		
Program Management									
FY2010 Automate verification of Full Funding Limit (FFL) qualification	Sep 30, 2010	0.302	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.302	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2010 O&M	Sep 30, 2010	2.232	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	2.232	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2010 Security & EA Initiatives	Sep 30, 2010	0.223	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.223	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2011 Planning	Sep 30, 2011	0.15	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.15	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2011 Consolidation, Performance Measurement, Customer Service, Usability Enhancements	Sep 30, 2011	0.275	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.275	[Not answered]	0	0	0
2011 Legislative Changes Support	Sep 30, 2011	0.088	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.088	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2011 PBGC Premium Filing Services Program Management	Sep 30, 2011	0.398	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.398	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2011 O&M	Sep 30, 2011	2.143	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	2.143	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2011 Security & EA Initiatives	Sep 30, 2011	0.233	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.233	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2012 Planning	Sep 30, 2012	0.16	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0.16	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2012 Consolidation, Performance Measurement,	Sep 30, 2012	0.288	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0.288	[Not answered]	0	0	0

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:									
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned:Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned:Actual		Schedule:Cost (# days/\$M)		
Customer Service, Usability Enhancements									
FY2012 Legislative Changes Support	Sep 30, 2012	0.091	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0.091	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2012 PBGC Premium Filing Services Program Management	Sep 30, 2012	0.408	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0.408	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2012 O&M	Sep 30, 2012	2.173	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	2.173	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2012 Security & EA Initiatives	Sep 30, 2012	0.24	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0.24	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2013 Planning	Sep 30, 2013	0.161	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.161	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2013 Consolidation, Performance Measurement, Customer Service, Usability Enhancements	Sep 30, 2013	0.303	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.303	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2013 Legislative Changes Support	Sep 30, 2013	0.094	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.094	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2013 PBGC Premium Filing Services Program Management	Sep 30, 2013	0.419	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.419	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2013 O&M	Sep 30, 2013	2.204	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	2.204	[Not answered]	0	0	0
FY2013 Security & EA Initiatives	Sep 30, 2013	0.238	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.238	[Not answered]	0	0	0